

REMARKS

Claims 8-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,678,732 (Mouko) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,272 (Aravamudan) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,533,654 (Small).

Mouko discloses a server allocating an IP address to a client device and implies that before the IP address is assigned to the client device, the client device does not have an IP address; and Aravamudan teaches a method for translating non Internet unique addresses of a home network device to an Internet unique address for Internet communication through a router.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of Mouko and Aravamudan fails to teach or suggest the recitation of upon receipt of a packet from the LAN device, determining whether the origination party's IP address is registered in the unique IP address allocation table, and relies upon Small to cure this deficiency. After reviewing Small, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

More particularly, to support his rejection, the Examiner states that Small (in Column 3, Line 64-Column 4, Line 4; and Column 8, Lines 27-49) discloses the recitation of determining whether the origination party's IP address is registered in the unique IP address allocation table. However, with reference to the cited passages, Small teaches monitoring a bus reset event which has the potential to change a physical address assigned to nodes and determining an updated physical address for a device on the network; and teaches updating an address resolution table with reassigned physical address data. However, reference to a step of determining whether the origination party's IP address is registered in the unique IP address allocation table, as recited by Claim 8, was not found.

Accordingly, as neither Mouko nor Aravamudan cure this deficiency, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 8 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), this Claim includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 8. Accordingly, Claim 14 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as those set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 8. Based on at least the forgoing, withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of Mouko, Aravamudan, and Small discloses each and every recitation of Claim 10. After reviewing the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

First, in the previous Response (dated May 10, 2006) it was argued that Mouko does not teach or suggest at least the recitation of a LAN device, connected to a router, for sending a request for a unique IP address allocation to the router, when an Internet application is started and it is determined that it is necessary to use a unique IP address, performing the application after receiving an allocated unique IP address from the router, and transmitting to the router a packet to be transmitted to the Internet by using an origination party's IP address as the LAN device's own LAN IP address, as recited in Claim 10. However, this argument was not fully addressed in the present Office Action. Further, the Examiner now relies upon recitations contained in other Claims of present application to support his rejection of Claim 10. For example, while it is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner acknowledges, at Page 7 of the Office Action, that the combination of Mouko and Aravamudan fails to teach or suggest the limitation of upon receipt of a packet from the LAN device, determining whether the origination party's IP address of the packet is registered in the unique IP address allocation table, Claim 10

includes distinguishing limitations having a different scope from the recitations relied upon by the Examiner to support his rejection.

Therefore, it is, once again, respectfully submitted that Mouko does not teach or suggest at least the recitation of a LAN device, connected to a router, for sending a request for a unique IP address allocation to the router, when an Internet application is started and it is determined that it is necessary to use a unique IP address, performing the application after receiving an allocated unique IP address from the router, and transmitting to the router a packet to be transmitted to the Internet by using an origination party's IP address as the LAN device's own LAN IP address, as recited in Claim 10. Accordingly, as this deficiency is not cured by either of Aravamudan or Small (which are discussed above) or the combination thereof, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 8, 10, and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 9, 11 –13, and 15-17, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 9, 11 –13, and 15-17 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 8-17, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG:ml